



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/518,695	03/03/2000	Seung-Hee Yi	P-053	7137

7590 12/02/2004

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP  
14500 AVION PARKWAY  
SUITE 125  
CHANTILLY, VA 20151

EXAMINER
----------

ODLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2662

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No. **09/518,695**Applicant(s) **YI, SEUNG-HEE**Examiner **David Odland**Art Unit **2662**

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-16, 18, 19, 23 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13-16, 18 and 19 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. The following is a response to the amendments filed on 07/13/2004.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lazar et al. (USPN 5,953,316), hereafter referred to as Lazar.

Referring to claim 23, Lazar discloses 23. (New) A routing method for a signaling network, comprising: checking a link determination history to determine whether a message is to be routed based on a same link selection field of a routing label of a message as a previous link selection field (checking a name space cache to see if the route of an ATM cell was previously set up (see column 4)) and routing the message through the corresponding link from the link determination history when the message has been previously routed using the same link selection field (if there is a cache 'hit' then the cell is transmitted over the corresponding path (see column 4)) and routing the message through a next available link excluding the link from the link determination history when the message has not been previously routed using the same link

Art Unit: 2662

selection field (if there is a cache 'miss' then the cell is routed over another path that is created (see column 4)).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazar in view of Glitho (USPN 5,544,154), hereafter referred to as Glitho.

Referring to claim 24, Lazar discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Lazar discloses updating the history after routing (the space cache is updated every 10 seconds (see column 4)). Lazar does not disclose whether or not to route the message to a local system. However, Glitho discloses analyzing whether the final destination of the message is a local system based on a result of the analysis (the switching node looks at the address of the incoming message to determine the next place to send the messages which is the destination if it is a neighboring node to the destination (see figures 1 and 2 and columns 4 and 5)), transferring the message to a message routing unit when the final destination is not the local system (the switching node routes messages based on the address of the incoming message to determine the next place to send the messages which is the destination if it is a neighboring node to the destination (see figures 1 and 2 and columns 4 and 5)). It would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 2662

skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement this feature into Lazar because doing so would allow the system to determine if the cells are local and thus save processing time and resources since they will not transfer the cells on to a core router.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

6. Claims 13-16, 18 and 19 are allowed.

*Conclusion*


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Odland whose telephone number is (571) 272-3096. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou, can be reached at (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

deo

November 28, 2004

  
**JOHN PEZZLO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**